

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The non-final Office Action of March 31, 2003, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended. Claims 1-5 remain pending.

The Specification has been amended to address the serial numbers of referenced U.S. Patent Applications missing from the specification, to remove the Table of Contents section, and to address minor editorial problems.

In amended Figure 1, reference numeral 111 was inadvertently excluded from the drawing. By this amendment, reference number 111 was added to identify the memory storage device coupled to the remote computer 109. Support for reference element 111 can be found in the written description. The size of all fonts in amended Figure 4 have been increased in response to the notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review. These revisions to Figure 1 and Figure 4 are not substantive and clearly do not add new matter. The attached Replacement Sheets are formal submittals of the amended Figure 1 and Figure 4.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Adobe Acrobat 3.0 Reader Online Guide," 9/1996, Adobe Systems, inc., pages 1-110 (hereinafter referred to as *Adobe*). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Amended independent claims 1 and 4 each recite, among other features, "a unified navigational context for allowing a user to interface with both the user interface document pages and the user content document pages in a one space model." *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest this feature of Applicants' claims 1 and 4. *Adobe* describes a system that includes a traditional and conventional dual space implementation. User interface pages and content pages are conventionally separate. Under the *Adobe* system, user interface elements and user document elements are separately spaced. The figure on page 2 of *Adobe*, like the figures on pages 105 to 110, illustrate the traditional and conventional dual space model. The figure on page 2 of *Adobe* shows a plurality of document pages on the right side of the screen shot. Further, a listing is

shown on the left side in a separate space. This listing is referred to as a “navigation pane” in *Adobe*. A navigation pane allows a user to go directly to a particular page in an Adobe formatted document. The cited reference includes handwritten notations on the figure shown on page 2 that certain aspects of the navigation pane and document pages include highlighted hyperlinks in blue. Depression of a hyperlink merely accesses another page in the document. User interface elements and content elements do not exist in one unified space. As clearly seen in the figures on page 2 and pages 105-110 of *Adobe*, user interface elements are found in the upper portion, in a separately defined space from the content. The activation switches to navigate, view history, retrace steps, and search are all user interface elements located in a separately defined space from the content document pages.

Applicants’ amended claims 1 and 4 each recite, among other features, “a unified navigational context for allowing a user to interface with both the user interface document pages and the user content document pages in a one space model.” Notably, under Applicants’ claims 1 and 4, there is no distinction between content documents and user interface documents; they are part of one space model. “The basic principle of the documents-with-links UI is that everything the user sees and interacts with is a document.” (Applicants’ page 9, lines 20-21). “Because there is no seam between UI and content, no notion of “dual spaces, the documents-with-links UI is conceptually simpler for the user than a model that has separate UI and content webs.” (Applicants’ page 8, lines 7-9). Indeed, *Adobe* employs a “dual” space or separately defined spaces for user interface elements and content elements. *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest a one space model. *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest, “a unified navigational context for allowing a user to interface with both the user interface document pages and the user content document pages in a one space model,” as recited, among other features, in Applicants’ claims 1 and 4. As such, since *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest every feature of Applicants’ claims 1 and 4, withdrawal of the rejections over *Adobe* is respectfully requested.

Applicants’ claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as its ultimate base claim and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Applicants’ amended claim 3 recites, among other features, “a unified navigational context for allowing a user to interact with both the user interface documents and the user

Appl. No. 09/456,249  
Amdt. Dated June 30, 2003  
Reply to non-final Office Action of March 31, 2003

content documents in a one space model by activating the user interface document links and the user content document links.” For substantially the same reasons as stated above with reference to Applicants’ amended claims 1 and 4, *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of Applicants’ claim 3. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants’ amended claim 5 recites, among other features, “executes commands by activating links on documents pages and wherein user content documents and user interface documents are presented in a one space model.” For substantially the same reasons as stated above with reference to Applicants’ amended claims 1 and 4, *Adobe* fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of Applicants’ claim 5. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. No fee is believed due, however, if any fees are required or if an overpayment has been made the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.**

Date: June 30, 2003

By:   
Gary D. Fedorochko  
Registration No. 35,509

1001 G Street, N.W.  
Eleventh Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
(202) 824-3000